DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 341 649 SP 033 513

AUTHOR	Neufeld, Barbara; Haavind, Sarah
TITLE	Professional Development Schools in Massachusetts: Beginning the Process.
INSTITUTION	Massachusetts Field Center for Teaching and Learning, Boston.
SPONS AGENCY	Massachusetts Governor's Office of Educational Affairs, Boston.; Massachusetts State Board of Regents of Higher Education, Boston.; Massachusetts State Dept. of Education, Boston.
PUB DATE	88
NOTE	60p.; For a related document, see ED 340 698.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Alternative Teacher Certification; *College School Cooperation; Cooperating Teachers; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Faculty Development; Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Design; School Role; *Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS	*Massachusetts; *Professional Development Schools

ABSTRACT

While none of the six school/college collaborations described in this report represents a fully developed professional development school (PDS), each focuses on components which might be included in a PDS. The six collaborative ventures in teacher education were carried out in Massachusetts during the 1987-88 academic year. Each program sought to improve the nature of school-based experiences for preservice and novice teachers and to improve the skill with which veteran teachers work with them. The programs were also involved in increasing the role of experienced classroom teachers in formal teacher education. Brief descriptions which highlight program features demonstrate that collaboration can lead to a variety of well designed, yet different programs. The report also discusses issues common to each of the programs and of concern in any long-term efforts to establish PDSs. These issues include: program design and implementation; the collaborative process; purpose, size, and scale; governance; impact; implications for urban schools; and issues related to children and teachers. An appendix provides names and addresses of program personnel. (IAH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED341649

Professional Development Schools in Massachusetts

Beginning the Process

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Karen O'Connor

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP033513

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Professional Development Schools in Massachusetts: Beginning the Process

Barbara Neufeld and Sarah Haavind

Education Matters, Inc.
Cambridge, MA

The Massachusetts Field Center for Teaching and Learning

This project was made possible by a grant from the Board of Regents of Higher Education, the Massachusetts Department of Education, and the Governor's Office of Educational Affairs. Education Development Center, Inc. provided assistance in the production of the report.

Copyright c 1988 by the Massachusetts Field Center for Teaching and Learning.

No part of this publication may be reproduced without written consent from the Massachusetts Field Center for Teaching and Learning.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....1

PART I: THE PROGRAMS.....6
Brockton High School and Bridgewater State College:
A "Pilot Partnership."".....6
Cambridge Rindge and Latin School/Lincoln-Sudbury
Regional HighSchool/Harvard Graduate School
of Education.....7
Devotion School, Brookline/Wheelock College.....9
East Longmeadow High School and the Academic Disciplines
Teacher Education Program of the School of Education
at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst.....11
MESTEP: The Mathematics, English and Science Teacher
Education Program, University of Massachusetts,
Amherst.....14
Wellesley College-School Collaborative for Improving
the Professionalism and Overall Qualificationns of
Secondary Teachers in Mathematics, Science, Computer
Learning, and Critical Foreign Languages.....16

PART II: CONSIDERATIONS ACROSS THE PROGRAMS.....20
Beginning Collaborative Programs.....22
Purposes.....22
Time.....24
Philosophical Compatibility.....25
Intersecting Rather than Isomorphic Sets of
Program Features.....26
Loosely Integrated Collaborations.....27
Program Design and Implementation Issues.....29
Selecting Participants: Cooperating, Student
and Mentor Teachers.....30
Developing an Educational Focus and a Set of
Instructional Strategies.....32
Broadening Participation at the School Level:
Issues of Size and Scope.....33
Long-Term Considerations.....35
Issues Related to Teachers.....35
Issues Related to Children.....38
What Kinds of Schools Can Become Professional
Development Schools.....39
Should Professional Development Schools Be School
Improvement Programs?.....40
Implications for Urban Schools.....41
School District Issues.....42
Governance Issues.....44

PART III. CONCLUSION: EFFORT AND OPPORTUNITY.....48
Notes.....50
References.....51
Appendix A: Program Personnel Names and Addresses

INTRODUCTION

During the 1987-1988 academic year, six sets of school districts and colleges in Massachusetts were involved with exciting, collaborative ventures in teacher education. Administrators, teachers and college faculty implemented programs designed to improve the nature of the school-based experiences available to future and novice teachers and the skill with which veteran teachers work with them. They also considered professional development needs for veteran teachers involved in supervising future teachers. These Massachusetts educators are in the forefront of a reform effort aimed at increasing the role of experienced classroom teachers in formal teacher education, and in creating schools in which it will be possible to:

> * test new models of professional education that are jointly designed and administered by school based practitioners and college faculty, and
>
> * provide a significant number of prospective teachers, novice teachers, and experienced teachers with high-quality training under the guidance of some of the Commonwealth's most able teachers. (Leading the Way, 1987)

Previous reform efforts in the Commonwealth have recognized the importance of veteran teachers' accumulated wisdom to the preparation of the next generation of teachers. For example, the teacher certification reform of 1979 placed greater responsibility on the cooperating teacher by increasing the time required for the practicum (student teaching) and requiring

three-way conferences between the student teacher, college supervisor and cooperating practitioner. But that effort was a classroom oriented strategy focused on individual classroom teachers and their assigned student teachers. It was also, primarily, a process reform. It did not encourage attention to the content of the practicum experience and its relationship to the content of the formal teacher education program, nor did it encourage attention to what cooperating teachers needed to know in order to work better with student teachers.

The current wave of reform certainly emphasizes the importance of individual classrooms and teachers, but it also stresses the development of a closer collaboration between college and school faculties around the content of the practicum and acknowledges that schools, not only individual classrooms, can be fertile ground in which to nurture future teachers. Such schools, evoke the principles outlined in the Holmes Group report, Tomorrow's Teachers (1986). That report imagines the formation of schools that would:

> ...provide superior opportunities for teachers and administrators to influence the development of their profession, and for university faculty to increase the professional relevance of their work, through (1) mutual deliberation on problems with student learning, and their possible solutions; (2) shared teaching in the university and schools; (3) collaborative research on the problems of educational practice; and (4) cooperative supervision of prospective teachers and administrators. (Tomorrow's Teachers, p.56)

These schools, known as Professional Development Schools, would also nurture veteran teachers by offering:

> ...talented persons who enter teaching, who love it and want to improve it, a means of advancing without leaving the classroom, physically or psychologically. Thus, senior teachers (Career Professionals) in a Professional Development School would be rewarded with the opportunity to be engaged in a variety of ways: in teaching, research teacher education, and policy formation. (Tomorrow's Teachers, p.58)

Tomorrow's Teachers envisions changing the organization of elementary and secondary schools prior to or at least in conjunction with efforts to create Professional Development Schools. In Massachusetts, educators are approaching the reform somewhat differently; they are creating elements of Professional Development Schools in schools as they are. Restructuring schools may ultimately be important to the creation of Professional Development Schools, but at the moment, it is not a focus of attention.

What issues need to be considered in the development and implementation of programs designed to create Professional Development Schools in today's schools? What do veteran teachers and college faculty need to know and know how to do in order to work better with pre-service teachers? How can they learn those things? And, what do we know about the benefits and potential pitfalls of schools designed to serve as professional development sites? These are the kinds of questions that spurred the Massachusetts Field Center for Teaching and Learning to seek out and support several extant efforts to develop

school/college collaborations focused on one or more of the components that might make up a Professional Development School. The Center understood that answers would emerge out of the experiences of those who sought to develop such schools.

This report is designed to convey what we have learned from the experiences of the six programs connected with the Center during the 1987-1988 academic year. (1) Its purpose is to help inform the thinking of those who now wish to develop school/college teacher education collaborations and, perhaps, create Professional Development Schools. To this end, we begin with brief descriptions written to highlight key program features and demonstrate that collaborations can lead to a variety of well-designed, yet different programs. We hope that their colleagues' creativity will inspire readers to generate additional collaborative ventures. (2)

The second section suggests that excitement and creativity must be tempered by thoughtfulness, and a bit of caution. It raises issues that cut across programs and pertain to, for example, program formation, collaboration, purpose, size and scale, governance and impact. Participants are excited by their collaborative programs. They are rightfully proud of their accomplishments and optimistic about the prospect of improving teacher education and teaching, and creating new roles for teachers. They have also been chastened by the complexity of their undertakings, by the demands of such programs even when the rewards are great, and by the amount of mutual learning and

sensitivity required. Part Two of the report is our effort to share these aspects of the experience so that they, too, can inform future school/college collaborations in teacher education.

PART I: THE PROGRAMS

Brockton High School and Bridgewater State College: A "Pilot Partnership."

The Brockton/Bridgewater Partnership has a set of goals that emphasizes the possibilities for mutual learning in collaborative arrangements. Chief among these goals is 1) increasing the involvement of secondary school teachers in teacher training at the high school and at the college, 2) providing students with increased opportunities for field experiences in an urban context, and 3) improving teaching and learning at the college and high school as a result of the collaborative enterprise. These goals are designed to be addressed in a pilot phase by a re-structuring of the current pre-practicum arrangement at Bridgewater State College.

The partnership primarily involves one secondary school social studies teacher and one member of the Bridgewater State faculty. The teacher carries a 3/5 teaching load and, with the other 2/5 of her time, 1) co-teaches the Pre-Practicum seminar which meets for one hour twice each week, 2) facilitates and coordinates the schedules for seminar members who observe eight hours of Social Studies classes and then complete 12 hours of practice teaching, and 3) supervises pre-practicum students when they are teaching. In addition, she serves as a mentor for student teachers placed in Brockton High School. Pre-practicum students are supervised more closely than in the past under this arrangement because the Brockton teacher has supervision time built into her schedule. With a Social Studies faculty of 37,

students have the opportunity to observe many different teachers and teaching styles and strategies. Their pre-practicum experiences are designed to intrigue them into considering a student teaching placement at Brockton High School. In the past, without this exposure to an urban setting, virtually all Bridgewater students chose to student teach at non-urban sites.

Co-teaching the Seminar facilitates the connection between campus and high school classroom work. Often, the Seminar is designed to offer strategies which students can observe in the co-leader's high school classroom the next day. Longer-term goals include broadening participation to include departments in addition to Social Studies.

For Additional Information Contact: (3)
Susan Szachowicz, Brockton High School
John Myers, Bridgewater State College

Cambridge Rindge and Latin School/Lincoln-Sudbury Regional High School/Harvard Graduate School of Education.

Funded by a grant from the Metropolitan Life Foundation, this collaboration is an extension of a historical relation between Cambridge Rindge and Latin School (CRLS), Lincoln-Sudbury High School and The Harvard Graduate School of Education. Key administrators at both high schools had had a variety of experiences at Harvard and knew each other. These two sites generally accommodate more practicum placements than do the several other sites with which Harvard has worked.

Participants had a number of reasons for wanting to work collaboratively. At Lincoln-Sudbury, teachers wanted to involve

themselves again in pre-service teacher education. Their involvement had virtually ceased in the early 1980's with the decline in teacher education students. In addition to such motivation, teachers at CRLS, being in an urban area rich with teacher education programs and research projects, faced constant demands by teacher education programs for placements. They wanted to formalize and stabilize their relationship with Harvard. With respect to instructional compatibility, teachers at Harvard and Lincoln-Sudbury were learning the instructional language and methods of Jonathan Saphier. Collaboration provided an opportunity to talk about teaching using a common language. Finally, teachers at both high schools wanted to share what they had learned about teaching with each other as well as with the next generation of teachers.

During the summer of 1987, participants developed a program designed to address the professional development needs of both novice and veteran teachers, a program that might help develop leadership roles for teachers that did not require them to relinquish classroom teaching. Toward this end, veteran teachers from each of the high schools were selected to become Teacher Leaders and participate in a curriculum course which pre-practicum students took at the Graduate School of Education. Teacher Leaders participated in this class and led small curriculum construction workshops designed to help prospective teachers develop materials and teaching strategies that they could use when student teaching. During the first year of this

collaboration, all applicants for the Teacher Leader position were accepted.

A second component of the collaboration is the "Teacher Leader Writing Group," a vehicle through which teachers could reflect about their teaching in general and their involvement in the collaborative program in particular. Teacher Leaders were not required to participate in this group; eight out of the 27 chose to involve themselves. The group met four times during academic year with teachers sharing their reflections.

Finally, there is a school-site component to this program which, again, is aimed primarily at the professional development of veteran teachers. It includes a) a teacher exchange in which teachers at one school have release time to visit colleagues at the other school, and b) a series of seminars and mini conferences that cover topics of interest to teachers at both schools.

For Additional Information Contact:

Diane Tabor, Cambridge Rindge and Latin High School
Laura Cooper, Lincoln-Sudbury Regional High School
Vicki Jacobs, Harvard Graduate School of Education

Devotion School, Brookline/Wheelock College.

The Devotion School/Wheelock College Collaboration is the only program currently in place at the elementary level. It began when two Devotion teachers took action on their longstanding desire to broaden teaching so that it no longer remained a "one-step career," to involve teachers in schoolwide decision making, and to lessen the isolation of teaching. The

Devotion/Wheelock project developed out of their primary concern for restructuring teachers' roles. Involvement with pre-service teacher education was one component of the implementation plan. The collaboration, from the perspective of the college, was a better way to bring together theory and practice for prospective teachers and help them explore new versions and dimensions of the teaching role. The program's design includes four components which, taken together address the various goals: 1) Second Adult in the Classroom, 2) Professional Development, 3) In-Class Remediation, and 4) Team Teaching.

1. Second Adult in the Classroom. In this collaboration, a graduate, teacher education student at Wheelock College serves a one-year, full-time internship with a participating Devotion teacher. The advantages of this component center on increased attention to children as a result of the additional adult, "coverage" so that the regular classroom teacher can leave the classroom to pursue professional development options, and a full-year, closely supervised teaching experience for the student teacher.

2. Professional Development. Teachers in Brookline call their professional development component Alternative Professional Teacher time (APT time). It is their opportunity to explore new roles that do not involve direct teaching. One teacher, for example, is pursuing curriculum development in the arts, another is studying how children learn to write fiction, and the third is working with Wheelock college as a supervisor and as an instructor of student teachers in Wheelock's student teaching seminar. As part of the collaboration, the student teaching seminar meets half of the time at Devotion School and half of the time on the Wheelock campus. Because of the presence of the interns, classroom teachers in this program can devote one third of their time to APT time.

3. In-House Remediation. This component of the program brings into the classroom services that would have been provided on a pull-out basis to children needing additional support services. The Remediation Liaison Teacher is part-time, but participates fully in planning meetings, has her own reading group, teaches one science unit, and serves as

a consultant to other team members who work with low-achieving students.

4. Team Teaching. In part, as an effort to reduce the isolation of teaching, classroom teachers in this collaboration have chosen to do some team teaching. They plan jointly for teaching science units, for example, and for discussing reading groups, record keeping and student progress. Built into the team concept are three thirty minute team meetings each week and a monthly half-day Saturday session. In addition, teachers hold daily discussions as they work together.

For Additional Information Contact:
Vivian Troen or Kitty Boles, Devotion School, Brookline
Karen Worth, Wheelock College, Boston

East Longmeadow High School and the Academic Disciplines Teacher Education Program of the School of Education at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

This secondary school, post-baccalaureate teacher education collaboration began when the principal of East Longmeadow High School (now Associate Superintendent), asked the University of Massachusetts at Amherst to place a cohort of student teachers in his school. He had three purposes in mind when he made this request. First, he wanted an opportunity to "look over" a new group of prospective teachers because he knew that he would be in a position to hire some in the near future. Second, he wanted to excite his veteran faculty by offering them an opportunity to share their expertise with future teachers. His assumption was that by working with student teachers, veterans would regain some lost enthusiasm for their own teaching. And, third, he felt an obligation to work on reforming the profession.

The principal's focus was primarily on future hiring and

his own faculty's professional needs. Faculty at the college had no difficulty with that focus, but they wanted to develop a clinical training site in which the school as well as individual cooperating teachers were supportive of prospective teachers' learning, a site in which there was close collaboration between the University and school, that would help bridge the gap between theory and practice. Out of this set of goals, the East Longmeadow/University of Massachusetts at Amherst Collaboration was born.

The program that developed (and continues to evolve) now involves approximately 20 high school teachers who make a substantial commitment to work with student teachers and the University. Those teachers complete University coursework in supervision and mentoring with the tuition paid by East Longmeadow. Coursework provides them with access to University faculty in a broad array of departments.

The program begins with a serious recruitment and selection process. As part of their introductory education course, prospective student teachers spend an entire school day at East Longmeadow hosted by interested high school faculty. Prospective student teachers observe two or three classes, talk with teachers who have volunteered to spend time with them, and are, in effect, treated as "members of the faculty" for the day. This experience helps them understand more about high schools in general, and specifically helps them decide whether they would like to student teach at East Longmeadow. If students wish to

student teach at the high school, they must participate in an application and selection process that closely resembles the normal hiring procedure faced by first-year teachers.

When student teachers are in the high school, cooperating teachers along with the student teachers participate in on-going, jointly planned seminars offered at the high school. Cooperating teachers who do not have a student teacher that term also participate, thus broadening the range of school faculty involved in teacher education. The seminars address a variety of issues that concern prospective teachers. For example, one teacher presented a session on planning, sharing her course syllabi so students could understand both long and short-term planning. Another presented a session on dyslexia. As an outgrowth to these presentations, the collaboration hopes to develop teams of teachers who can serve as resources to student teachers on particular issues.

The seminars give the entire cohort of students and cooperating teachers an opportunity to work together. It reinforces the "cohort" nature of the experience and, because students have input into the seminar program, it provides them with the opportunity to reflect on their own professional development needs and decide what they would like to learn. In addition to the cooperating teachers, students have available to them a clinical supervisor from the University who is on-site at East Longmeadow two days each week.

Finally, University faculty are engaged in an in-depth study of the development, implementation and impact of the development of a clinical training site. They intend to use their research both to improve the program and inform the development of other clinical training sites.

For Additional Information Contact:

Peter Cannone, East Longmeadow Public Schools,
Helen Schneider, University of MA, Amherst
Earl Seidman, University of MA, Amherst

MESTEP: The Mathematics, English and Science Teacher Education Program, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

MESTEP, also developed at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, is a post-baccalaureate program for math, science and English majors who had not intended, when undergraduates, to pursue high school teaching. Started in 1983, it is designed to offer participants teacher education, business experience and two paid internships as part of the program's structure. It involves the University in a network of public schools and 12 Massachusetts corporations.

Admission is an intensive, highly selective process, resulting in acceptance of approximately 20 out of 125 applicants. After initial screening, potential students are invited to a day of interviews. They spend the morning in interviews with school system teams, the afternoon with corporate interview teams. At the end of the day, MESTEP has feedback on each applicant from seven or eight organizations. Then, final decisions are made about admissions, and, when

possible, about where the student might complete the business and school internships.

The program is successful in its efforts to recruit minority students to careers in teaching. About 25% of the students are members of minority groups, and about two thirds are women. Half of the students come directly from college; half have somewhere between one to five years of work experience.

Once admitted, students spend June in intensive coursework that introduces them to teaching, including some classroom observation. In the summer, students staff part of the Acton/Boxborough summer school under the supervision of a group of certified teachers who do not teach but serve as full-time mentors. Student teachers teach in the morning and spend the afternoon working with their mentors on planning, teaching strategies, discipline and classroom management more broadly, for example. Because mentors work with a group of student teachers, there is a "team" quality to the experience that enables teachers and prospective teachers to draw on each others' experiences. Some of the work is subject specific; some of it is generic. Mentors help students prepare teaching units for their academic year internships as well (something which is feasible because most interns know where they will be teaching.)

During the school year, two student teachers become interns under Massachusetts' certification regulations, replacing a classroom teacher in a public school system, one for the first

half of the school year and the other for the second half. The program is working to cluster interns in schools that can become clinical training sites. To supervise the interns, MESTEP hires a support teacher in the interns' school to work with interns throughout the year. In addition, the University hires a "University Supervisor," often a mentor from the summer program, who provides additional support and continuity during the internship.

In the non-teaching term, MESTEP students serve as interns in the corporate setting. When they have completed the program, become certified, and won their first teaching job, MESTEP graduates have the opportunity to continue their corporate work during summers.

For Additional Information Contact:

Richard J. Clark, Director, MESTEP
George Frost, Director, Acton-Boxborough Summer School Program

Wellesley College-School Collaborative for Improving the Professionalism and Overall Qualifications of Secondary Teachers in Mathematics, Science, Computer Learning, and Critical Foreign Languages.

The Wellesley College-School Collaborative was designed primarily to support the professional development of veteran teachers. According to the Project Director, it is based on the assumption that providing veteran teachers with opportunities to pursue their interests is the best way to address school reform. A secondary goal of the Collaborative is to create a forum in which Wellesley faculty and public school practitioners meet to

discuss educational issues, broadening the perspectives of both parties and strengthening the connections between 1) the college and the community, and 2) the college and the Boston Public Schools.

The project, funded by the U. S. Department of Education Secretary's Discretionary Program for Mathematics, Science, Computer Learning, and Critical Foreign Languages, involves Wellesley College, Wellesley Middle and High Schools, Boston Latin School and Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT). It consists of four interrelated in-service and pre-service components:

* sabbaticals and a fellowship program for veteran teachers
* weekly seminars for participants, held at the College
* an apprentice teacher program
* a master teacher program

Sabbaticals and the Fellowship Program. Participating veteran teachers receive sabbaticals equal to a 20% reduction in their course load during which time they are Fellows at Wellesley College. They are encouraged to use their time to study, explore, think, and create. "Fellow" status provides them with access to campus resources for the academic year.

In order to become a Fellow, math, science and foreign language teachers at the three schools were invited to submit proposals to a panel consisting of teachers, department heads, principals, and two members of the Wellesley College faculty. In this first year, the project accepted all the teachers who applied. Proposal topics included:

* involving students of Spanish and French in computer correspondence with students in other schools

* developing data based teaching resources for foreign languages

* developing video resources focused on Central America that present actual interviews and events with narratives geared to student ability and curriculum.

Seminars. Fellows and novice teachers attend weekly seminars together facilitated by a Wellesley College Education Department professor. One seminar included math and science teachers, the other foreign language teachers. During seminar time, veteran and apprentice teachers discussed the veterans' on-going projects and issues raised by the apprentices. Guest presentations by other college faculty are included in the design to encourage dialogue between school practitioners and professors.

Apprentice Teacher Program. Under this collaborative program, novice teachers are hired for one year to replace regular teachers who are on leave as Fellows. Hired to teach for 80% time, they have 20% of their schedule available for additional planning and preparation time. According to the design, Master Teachers provide support and guidance to the apprentice teachers.

Master Teacher Program. The Master Teacher component of the program is based on the idea that outstanding veteran teachers know a great deal about teaching well. The program is designed to use their knowledge and skills to assist the apprentice teachers. This component of the program is not a

pre-planned set of activities, but rather a clinical experience in which the Master Teachers will provide help as it is needed.

For Additional Information Contact:
Alan November, Wellesley Public Schools
Ken Hawes, Wellesley College

PART II: CONSIDERATIONS ACROSS THE PROGRAMS

There is a terrific excitement among participants in these six programs. They are rightfully proud of their accomplishments and optimistic about the prospect of improving teacher education and teaching. With burgeoning national attention on the ideas embodied in Professional Development Schools, and with the prospect of state funding to initiate them, additional schools and colleges are considering moving in the same direction.

Although this may be a good thing, we want to clarify two points at the outset of this discussion. First, none of the programs we described, with perhaps one exception, was necessarily a school program. These programs are better described as efforts to improve the field based component of teacher education by involving classroom teachers as teacher educators. The notion of what the school is or might become as a teacher education site has barely been addressed by these programs to date.

Second, collaborative efforts to involve teachers more effectively can be worthwhile whether or not they are embedded in a school site change that creates a Professional Development School. The programs we looked at in Massachusetts might best be thought of as collaborative ventures that might or might not lead to Professional Development Schools, but which are thoughtful and potentially beneficial in either case. The distinction is also important because we have only begun to

think about the impact of creating schools as organizations in which teacher education is a significant goal. The current programs are at embryonic stages and it is not clear that all of them are heading in that direction.

Collaborations that lead to the creation of Professional Development Schools are one approach to the improvement of teacher education and schools. But they are not the only one. There is a danger that the excitement surrounding the current programs will lead us to think that they are the best or only way to proceed, that other options for improving teaching and teacher education pale in comparison. We do not wish to make that claim and we encourage others to avoid this orientation as well.

Having said all of this, it is our intention not to discourage such collaborative ventures, but to enlighten prospective partners about what is involved in their development and sustenance so that they can make informed choices. The design and implementation of the six programs form the data base for this discussion, as does our knowledge of program implementation and school/college collaboration gleaned from other research and experience. Our goal is to use the "wisdom of practice" to inform the future growth of Professional Development Schools in the Commonwealth. This wisdom can inform other kinds of beneficial, collaborative arrangements as well.

Beginning Collaborative Programs.

Purposes. The collaborations that we focused on began because an individual, group of individuals, or institution wanted to accomplish something for which collaboration seemed the appropriate approach. For example, several districts wanted an opportunity to "look over" prospective teachers in an effort to make good hiring decisions, but they had limited, and in one case no access to "prospectives" because they had only minimal involvement with student teachers. To remedy the situation, districts were interested in creating relationships with universities so that student teachers would be placed in the districts' schools. The desire of some college faculty to create clinical training sites that might grow into Professional Development Schools made the matches workable. These different and yet compatible purposes led to relationships.

Other programs started to broaden the roles of classroom teachers to include out-of-classroom activities during the school day. Teacher empowerment and diversified roles to entice teachers to remain in teaching were fundamental program goals. To implement this idea, to enable classroom teachers to take on new roles and responsibilities, teachers needed to find a way to cover their classes. Prospective teachers were involved to help fulfill the program's goals.

Collaborations also began because a university saw benefits in working with a school district. For example, one university needed summer placements for an innovative Master's level

teacher certification program, the goal of which was not the reform of schools and teaching but the increase of math, English and science teachers and the recruitment of members of minority groups to teaching in today's schools.

In the cases of the programs we studied, collaborations grew out of genuine need for partners. The parties involved approached each other quite explicit about what they wanted from the enterprise. They negotiated agreements, disagreed, and sometimes changed partners before striking a deal. The conversations involved partners becoming aware of and sensitive to each other's purposes and goals. They found ways to develop programs that could accomplish both partners' sets of goals, only some of which were overlapping, and only some of which were directly related to the ideas embodied in the idea of a Professional Development School.

The next set of Professional Development Schools is unlikely to evolve in the same way. The occasion of money, the presence of a grants program, in other words, by design will lead institutions to think about working collaboratively. This is not to suggest cynically that the parties will collaborate only to get money, but to suggest that money rather than an intrinsic educational or organizational need will propel the process. Funding criteria, application deadlines, and selection criteria will likely guide the development of partnerships and the shapes of the collaborations. Public policy will encourage institutions to move in the direction considered beneficial.

But, at the same time, such factors may mitigate against partners carefully considering what each wants from the enterprise and deciding how to work it out. They may push partners in the direction of masking differences in an effort to "get the application in." Such short-circuiting can produce negative consequences for the intellectual coherence and organizational stability of the programs. Proposal guidelines that encourage deliberation and do not penalize partners for making changes as they proceed could alleviate some of these potential problems.

Time. Finding a partner and striking a deal took each of the programs at least several months. It took time for school-based people to get appointments with university faculty and administrators, for college faculty to meet and consider proposed collaborations, for school-based people to decide whether they wanted to go along with the college or public school administrator's plans, for example. Collaboration took time even though these participants, for the most part, knew each other reasonably well and knew what they wanted before they began their joint ventures.

Although the amount of time involved was frustrating for those who knew what they wanted to do and assumed that others would see the virtue in their projects, time used for careful consideration, explication and clarification, was time well spent. It enabled partners to experience working together, a benefit to decisions about further collaboration. It enabled

them to be reasonably sure that they shared common orientations to teacher education, without which, no collaboration seemed likely.

Philosophical Compatibility. It is not surprising that partners in these on-going collaborations share common views of core aspects of teaching and learning to teach. Were it otherwise, they would not be working together. But having said this does not diminish the importance of the philosophical matches. Wheelock College was happy to work with the teachers at Devotion, not only because faculty knew them, but because they shared enough common assumptions about child development and its importance to teaching and learning that the college felt the school site would be supportive of its program. Philosophical compatibility was assured in the Brockton/Bridgewater project because key participants had worked together many times before and knew they shared common views.

Colleges want to insure that they are placing student teachers/interns in settings that support the colleges' programs. Classroom teachers who will be working closely with college faculty need to know that they share similar outlooks on teaching and learning. One program explicitly developed a way to test their potential compatibility. The East Longmeadow/U MASS Amherst collaboration, developed and implemented the day long visit of pre-practicum students to the high school in part as a test of their ability to work together in a longer, more complicated venture. Philosophical match will need explicit

attention among new partners. It is essential for a compatible collaboration.

Intersecting Rather than Isomorphic Sets of Program Features. In forming and sustaining collaborative ventures, partners do not have to equally value all program components. They do have to agree that included components are not detrimental to their goals and they must be willing to compromise and try strategies that interest their partners. So, for example, in one program, college faculty indicated that they did not need to have public school teachers involved in the student teaching seminar, although one teacher wanted to have such a role. They were agreeable, however, to have the teacher take an informal role in the seminar because it was not an incompatible idea. A school system's desire to "look over" prospective teachers or to engender re-newed enthusiasm for teaching in a veteran faculty by involving them with young, enthusiastic novices, is not the same as the college's goal of developing stable, high quality field experiences. But, the goals are compatible.

As noted earlier, participants had intrinsic goals that they could not accomplish, or could not accomplish well enough, alone. This need for assistance, not the presence of identical goals, characterized the occasion of the collaborations.

New collaborations formed as a result of the presence of money, may result in partners, one or both of which lack the intrinsic educational/programmatic reasons to collaborate. The

result might be some collaborations that are dominated by the partner who did have a goal to achieve joining with a partner willing to go along with that goal in order to be a beneficiary of the program, but unclear about its own goals and objectives. If this occurs, collaboration will be less equal than in the programs currently in progress and one partner or one set of constituents might lose or feel used by the arrangement.

Loosely Integrated Collaborations. Public and private, large and small teacher education programs are currently involved in collaborative arrangements with suburban and urban public schools. What is characteristic of the programs to date is that they do not change or require change on the part of the larger organization in which they exist. They make a difference, to be sure, to the institutions, and they require some tinkering with scheduling and the allocation of teachers' time, but they are separate entities rather than new operating systems for the core organization. For this reason, we suggest that they were easier to develop than future programs which may be designed to be more integral to schools and colleges.

Why were these programs able to develop in this way? First, they were small, involved volunteers and made few if any demands on non-participating teachers and faculty members. They enriched segments of school life without seeking to change the school. They were collaborations in teacher education rather than Professional Development Schools. As the programs grow, however, we suspect teachers and faculty will have to pay more

attention to their colleagues' sentiments, to issues of turf and control of organizational resources. For example, one program proposed having a high school teacher serve as the college's supervisor for a student teacher in an effort to develop a clinical appointment for the high school teacher. College faculty members objected to this merger of roles and to what they saw as a threat to their job security. The proposal was dropped.

Second, these programs were "pilots" as well as small. As pilots, they had a temporary quality which helped them remain organizationally apart and, therefore, not immediately threatening to the status quo either at the schools or at the colleges. Those programs supported solely by external funding, in particular fell into this "temporary" and non-threatening category.

Over the long term, the goal of Professional Development Schools is to change significant features of at least some public schools and of teacher education programs. If this goal persists, as partners work together to create larger organizational and programmatic change, institutions and individuals not originally involved in these pilots will be affected as will aspects of incentive and reward structures. At the college level, for example, there generally are dis-incentives even for teacher education faculty to spend their time in field based activities. Colleges are more likely to reward research and publishing than supervision. If colleges

participate in Professional Development Schools, then their incentive system may need to be re-arranged so that participating faculty do not negatively influence their careers.

We know little to date about the impact of such changes on the development and implementation of collaborative arrangements. However, we suspect that governance, incentive and educational issues at both colleges and public schools might lead to new organizational structures with new job descriptions and a new ability of partners to influence one another's work. We turn to these issues next, beginning with a set of program design and implementation issues, then addressing governance issues that will likely be central to both colleges and schools and ending with a set of educational issues most especially salient at the public school level.

Program Design and Implementation Issues.

The six functioning programs are distinct from one another, the result of joint ventures aimed at addressing participants' interests and concerns. They are programs in the process of evolving as participants learn from their experiences. Therefore, what future programs can learn from these pilots is not "how to do it," or what a collaborative program should look like when complete, but rather what issues to consider in designing and implementing programs. In this section, we highlight issues that emerged in the course of these programs' development. We begin at the individual teacher level, moving next to school and school district issues that need

consideration as programs are designed and implemented.

Selecting Participants: Cooperating, Student and Mentor Teachers. Not surprisingly, schools attempted to draw their strongest teachers into working with prospective teachers, and strong teachers were most likely to initiate collaborative programs. Colleges also chose their strongest students, when possible, for these pilot programs. As one faculty member noted, "We stacked the deck in our favor." This was a good idea. It meant that the first year of these novel programs had the best possible opportunity for success, or, at least, the quality of participants would not likely jeopardize the outcome. We know from a few examples that dilemmas will arise when a more normal distribution of prospective and cooperating teachers is involved. Many factors will influence who gets involved as these programs continue and it is likely to be easier to select participants at the start than when the program is established or growing. If a program is viewed as worthwhile or if it confers status or offers other extrinsic rewards, many teachers may want to be involved. If teachers are paid for the time that they are involved with prospective teachers, there may be a tendency to spread the financial incentive around by rotating student teachers among faculty, even if, all faculty are not equally qualified to work with student teachers. To do otherwise would be to establish an implicit hierarchy of teachers at the school level, something that may be unacceptable to teachers and administrators. Programs that wish to be

selective will need criteria and a process by which to decide that some teachers are better qualified to be mentors/cooperating teachers than are others. Program design might well include some attention to this issue.

Selection criteria are also an issue with respect to prospective teachers. Several of the pilot programs are designed for those who are academically talented, learn quickly and have the interpersonal/organizational skills that enable them to move immediately into classroom teaching. In the Devotion/Wheelock Program, for example, interns enable cooperating teachers to pursue their Alternative Professional Time projects. Were the interns unable to teach independently, their cooperating teachers would have difficulty leaving the classroom. The entering skills and capacities of the student teachers then, have a direct impact on cooperating teachers' ability to be relieved of teaching responsibility in order to pursue their own professional development interests.

There is nothing wrong with programs designed to take advantage of excellent prospective teachers. However, prospective teachers vary in their academic and experiential expertise and programs will have to think hard about the qualifications their design requires and the limitations such qualifications may place upon the program. Program developers might also think about ways to design Professional Development Schools so that they are suitable for the range of prospective teachers, not only the elite.

Developing an Educational Focus and a Set of Instructional Strategies. No one seriously disputes the importance of classroom teaching experience for prospective teachers, and yet the content (in contrast to the structure) of that experience gets surprisingly little explicit attention. Teacher education programs and cooperating teachers might agree that prospective teachers should have experience teaching algebra to two different levels of students, for example, but they rarely discuss what it is that prospective teachers should learn about teaching or about teaching algebra or about teaching different kinds of learners from those experiences. And, they rarely discuss what cooperating teachers need to know and be able to do in order to help student teachers achieve those goals.

The thinking that will go into creating collaborative programs and/or Professional Development Schools is an opportunity to address 1) what it is that prospective teachers should learn from the field-based component of their teacher education, 2) how the experience might be structured to facilitate that learning, and 3) what cooperating teachers need to know and how they might learn it in order to be most helpful to prospective teachers. As several of the extant programs demonstrate, collaborative ventures provide a context in which practitioners' wisdom can contribute to the knowledge brought by university faculty. Jointly held seminars that involve school and university faculty in designing and implementing the student teaching seminar and in deciding what should be included in the

student teaching experience are efforts to think explicitly and creatively about the content as well as the structure of teaching experience for prospective teachers.

Broadening Participation at the School Level: Issues of Size and Scope. The collaborative programs currently in operation in the Commonwealth are small and that smallness has been advantageous. It has helped the collaborations remain manageable and relatively non-threatening. But most of the programs and the thrust of the Professional Development School effort is to create schools rather than small programs that do not affect schools. Our involvement with the small programs leads us to raise some issues about size and extent of participation that can inform deliberations about future program development.

First, there are problems associated with small programs that may wish to remain small (even though to this point we have mentioned their virtues as start-up ventures). As one administrator noted, small programs can be difficult to integrate into the school and run the risk of isolating people from one another. It is possible that non-program teachers will resent something "special" happening in one part of the school. The small program might shift participating teachers' attention away from their non-participating colleagues. Participating teachers may have been available for a wide array of school and colleague related activities that they no longer have time for even though they themselves have improved collegial relations

and have enriched their work as teachers. The school as a whole, in other words, might not benefit from the professional development of a small cadre of teachers within it if those teachers become isolated from the rest of the faculty.

On the other hand, it is worth considering what might happen if a program does encompass the whole school. Certainly, the management demands will become greater and it is not clear who will be responsible for the daily operation of the teacher education features of a Professional Development School. In that regard, the small programs do not help us understand how larger programs will afford teachers time to pay attention to their primary focus -- the education of children and adolescents. Nor is it clear yet how to insure that elementary and secondary students are not taught more often by student teachers and interns than by experienced teachers.

Finally, in most of these programs, there is no clearly articulated role for the principal, the individual who remains responsible for the teaching, learning and the individuals who are working in the building. While programs remain small, they require little administrative time. But principals pointed out that larger programs would involve them in scheduling considerations, meeting with interns, and keeping track of the various people who are coming and going in the building for a range of purposes.

Size and scope presents similar issues for the colleges. Several of the collaboratives are small and only loosely

connected to the college's core teacher education faculty and/or program. They involve a few faculty members who wanted to get involved or they involve a very small program, all of whose faculty wanted to participate. In addition, the programs are entities funded, for the most part, by external resources. Thus, for the moment, they do not have an impact on the college or teacher education program as a whole. With increasing size and scope, this will change. Faculty at the college, like their counterparts in the public school may or may not want to be involved. Programs at the college level will be faced with the same dilemmas regarding recruitment and selection of participants as will be their elementary and secondary school colleagues.

Long-Term Considerations. We have been focusing on the initial phases of collaborative programs, noting that while they are exciting, promising enterprises, experience with them suggests that we would do well to pay attention to certain organizational and substantive issues as we continue. We mention several at this point that have emerged from the current collaborations and which seem relevant to the long-term implementation of these new arrangements.

Issues Related to Teachers.

1. Mentors or cooperating teachers may tire of working in collaborative arrangements and they may want a reprieve from involvement with prospective teachers. They may find, for example, that while team teaching has tremendous advantages, it

is demanding and the demands do not outweigh the disadvantages of working alone. Or, teachers may not choose to team all of the time or every year even if it has advantages. They may find it fragmenting as well as exhilarating to work at the university and the school. They may prefer to give up working with adults in return for more time teaching children. In effect, teachers may find that their work lives are excessively complicated by creative arrangements that require them to take on new roles and integrate their work with that of their colleagues. As a result, participants may want to phase themselves in and out of collaborative arrangements and programs will need a way to accommodate this situation (which should not be seen as a program failure). Programs also would benefit from designs that consider, at the outset, the cumulative program effects on teachers and attempt to minimize programs' burdensome potential.

2. Teachers may find it difficult to learn their new roles and to implement them. It will not always be easy to learn to use release time for curriculum development or research. Learning to work collaboratively with college faculty in the development of student teaching seminars or other courses, for example, will likewise be potentially stressful especially in the early stages. Difficulties cannot always be avoided, nor are they intrinsically bad, but they will require attention if programs are to persist and teachers are truly to have the opportunities to broaden their roles in schools. Teachers, for example, may need help actually using their release time for

activities that are not directly connected to teaching children.

3. If programs are successful in creating new opportunities, new roles for teachers, then teachers will have to learn how to work in an organization in which they do not all do the same thing, in which they do not all spend the same amount of time with children. This will be a major intervention in school culture, one which will need attention to avoid the proliferation of comparisons, competition and rivalries among teachers.

4. To the extent that teachers fundamentally want to work with children, new arrangements that reduce their direct involvement with children may leave some less satisfied with their work. Programs will need to consider how to deal with teachers who do not want to be involved in Professional Development Schools activities. Will that be an option?

5. Programs benefit from the presence of key individuals, yet the importance of particular individuals can be both a program's strength and weakness that has long-term implications. Several of the pilot programs would disappear if one key teacher or faculty member left. Others are dependent on keeping, not key individuals, but teachers in particular grades or subject areas. For the long-term health of these collaborative, Professional Development School efforts, programs may have to pay attention to developing a cadre of teachers to avoid the vulnerability associated with dependence on particular individuals.

Issues Related to Children. What will happen, we wonder, to the children who attend classes in Professional Development Schools? The effort to create collaborative arrangements in Massachusetts is, of course, ultimately connected to the improvement of teaching and, therefore, children's learning. Yet, little is explicitly said about the impact of these various program designs on the children in classrooms. One or two programs, to be sure, addressed this issue explicitly; the others did not. Written materials from the state do not explicitly talk about the immediate and longer-term student impact of this reform. We are concerned with tomorrow's teachers and today's students. We know that teachers in these programs share similar concerns which we now outline.

1. Depending on school size and the distribution of prospective teachers, students in secondary schools may find themselves being taught by novices or student teachers in several subjects each year. This concern and its potential cumulative effect was brought to our attention by secondary school teachers deeply committed to their collaborative program but suddenly aware of this unintended impact on students.

2. As a result of the increase in student teachers, regular teachers may know their students less well, may feel less connected to them and therefore less able to respond to their individual needs. This is especially true if student teachers work with the same cooperating teacher for two semesters. Again, this issue was raised by participating

teachers.

3. If the "best" teachers are involved in working with student teachers, in other collaborative ventures, or in curriculum development and research, they will spend less time teaching children. Again, what will be the impact of these changes on children's educational opportunities?

In raising these teacher and student issues, we do not intend to be negative or to suggest that the ideas embodied in Professional Development Schools will not work. Rather, it is our intention to raise them because they are genuine and because programs would do better to consider and address them than to deny their existence. The teachers who raised these concerns did not consider them fatal flaws in program design; they considered them potentially troublesome side effects that would have to be taken into account as collaborative efforts continued. Teachers' sensitivity and insight into the complexity of the present endeavor suggests the benefits of having these early, pioneering ventures from which we can learn.

What Kinds of Schools Can Become Professional Development Schools? When colleges place student teachers in classrooms, assuredly they are concerned about more than the individual classroom in which the student will practice teach. But, the emphasis is primarily on the classroom experience with an individual teacher. In increasing the emphasis on the school as the placement, colleges need to consider a broader set of organizational features than in the past and they need to

consider working with teachers as colleagues. Teachers and administrators have to consider what it means for the school to be involved more broadly in teacher education. Thus, school site and faculty characteristics and qualities become important in new ways. The following set of questions draws attention to some of the issues that may be salient in these endeavors:

* What models of teaching will be available to students?
* What "school climate" factors matter?
* How large or small is the school and how much of it will be involved?
* How will this program affect students?
* What kind of experience will prospective teachers have with racial, ethnic, economic and academic diversity?
* What else is the school doing and how will becoming a Professional Development School mesh with those other efforts?

Both schools and colleges would do well to think about these questions that can help clarify what is available in the partnership and what each partner needs from the arrangement. Addressing these kinds of questions might help clarify what it is that colleges and schools believe should be included in a field experience, what they want prospective teachers to learn and how that might best be organized. They will help address issues such as how much one school site has to offer in order to be a Professional Development School or a partner in a collaboration. And, they will draw attention to the issue of what would it take to improve a school sufficiently so that it would be an effective teacher education site.

Should Professional Development Schools Be School Improvement Programs? Although Professional Development Schools are meant to be schools that pay attention to veteran as well as

novice and pre-service teachers, it is not clear which emphasis should come first. If a school's faculty is in need of a great deal of in-service professional development, if teaching and learning, in other words, are not uniformly adequate throughout a school, is becoming a Professional Development School a way to achieve better teaching and learning? Could a troubled faculty use this program to get help and then improve enough to become a training site for new teachers? Or does a school have to be good enough to be a training site at the beginning? Can and should Professional Development Schools, in other words, be school improvement projects?

Implications for Urban Schools. We raise this issue specifically because of its implications for involving urban schools as Professional Development sites. If teacher education programs have a serious commitment to preparing teachers to work in our cities, then it is reasonable to assume that they will want their prospective teachers to have experience teaching in those schools. Yet, due to the variety of constraints under which such schools operate, they may not be adequate training sites. Too often excellent teachers seek transfers out of such schools; too often administrators have little influence over hiring or other personnel decisions. Local policies and negotiated contracts may lead to significant faculty changes each year. Centrally mandated policies about the efficacy of particular styles of teaching or classroom organization or curriculum and pacing, for example, may make urban schools less

attractive as teacher preparation sites. These conditions may make it difficult for urban schools to maintain a cadre of excellent teachers who could work effectively with prospective teachers or who could be afforded the flexibility to have release time to pursue other professional development activities. If the Commonwealth is committed to improving the quality of teachers who work in urban areas, then it will likely be important to develop ways in which urban schools can be involved as Professional Development sites for prospective and in-service teachers.

School District Issues.

Professional Development Schools will exist within school districts and school district administrators and School Committees will be involved in 1) initial decisions about whether to participate, 2) design considerations, 3) implementation issues and, ultimately, 4) evaluation of the schools. From extant programs' experience, we know something about the complex issues that will arise as this effort goes forward. Certainly, we know that school district support is essential to the development of Professional Development Schools. What are the ways that school districts are implicated?

First, involvement in collaborative teacher education ventures and efforts to broaden teachers' roles requires new job descriptions, release time, and scheduling changes, for example, that can be developed at the school level but which need

district support for their implementation. Even if faculty transfers are not involved, principals will be reluctant or unable to proceed with new arrangements absent central office approval. Central office personnel will be concerned with the connection between district goals and objectives and the Professional Development activities in individual schools.

Second, there will be fiscal issues accompanying Professional Development Schools that involve multi-agency relationships. It is the district that is responsible for financial decisions and accounting procedures. Districts will not only be important because their approval for expenditures will influence program implementation, they will have to allocate time to the management of Professional Development accounts.

Third, districts will be involved in staffing considerations. If the Professional Development School is seen as a benefit that teachers across the district want to share, districts will have to deal with transfers into and out of such schools. Such staffing decisions may well become issues for collective bargaining whether or not teachers receive additional compensation for some of their work.

Fourth, districts will want to insure that schools set realistic goals for their professional development work. They will be concerned that programs not become over-ambitious, thus drawing attention away from the schools' central work: teaching children. In this regard, districts will have to be

particularly attentive to parents' concerns. On the one hand, parents may worry about the extent to which their children will be taught by novices and/or student teachers. On the other hand, parents whose children are not in Professional Development Schools may feel that their children are being denied the enriched programs that result from such schools' curriculum development and research efforts. Equity and quality are likely to become concerns as these reforms move forward.

Fifth, and finally, school districts will need to be involved in the evaluation of Professional Development Schools in order to determine whether they are educationally and cost effective. The evaluation role implies that districts need to be involved in the collaborative development of goals and objectives by which such programs can be evaluated.

The pilot programs have been somewhat insulated from these district concerns to date in part because of their pilot status. Those contemplating the next phase of development, however, will need to consider these and other district concerns.

Governance Issues.

When we talk about involving classroom teachers and whole schools more seriously in teacher education, we are talking about a shift in authority from the college to the school site. We are saying that classroom teachers have knowledge and skills to contribute to the teacher education experience that, heretofore, has not been tapped. Having re-evaluated the contribution of practicing teachers to teacher education, we are

now faced with re-considering their influence. What kind of influence should they have, for example, in evaluating future teachers? In making decisions about the content of both the field experience and the on-campus components of teacher education programs? How might teachers' perspectives influence what and how college faculty teach? Who will be in charge of teacher education, in other words, when a significant component of it is in the hands of public school teachers, and students continue to pay tuition to colleges of education which are accredited by the state?

Hidden in this broad formulation are other questions that relate to governance. Who, ultimately, will select the cooperating teachers and mentors and how will disagreements be resolved? Who will decide whether classroom teachers' participation in college courses/seminars is advantageous, in general and/or whether a particular teacher is effective? Will some college faculty lose their positions to school-based teacher educators?

What is the role of the principal in Professional Development Schools? Not too long ago, principals' stars had risen; they were identified as key to school improvement efforts. It appears that teachers have eclipsed them in this latest reform. But principals remain responsible for teaching and learning in their schools, and, to the extent that they have developed skills as instructional leaders as a result of previous reforms, they may not be willing to remain apart from

this latest venture. It would, indeed, be foolish to exclude their contributions, but our experience with the pilot programs suggests that, in most cases, their role is undefined. In several cases, they were not involved in program development or implementation.

Principals are aware of their marginal status in several of the pilot programs. They remind us that:

1. they would like a role in deciding whether such programs come into their schools in the first place,

2. they would like a role in making staffing decisions for such programs,

3. they will need assistance or a shift in responsibility in order to oversee the implementation of school/college collaborations or Professional Development Schools, and,

4. they will need district support in order to facilitate program implementation.

As Professional Development Schools take form, these administrative concerns deserve considerable attention.

Program developers and district administrators would also do well to help teachers understand the legal and organizational constraints under which school districts operate. For too long, teachers have paid close attention to their classrooms, minimal attention to schoolwide decision making and virtually no attention to district decision making. There is no experiential history that enables teachers to understand why district administrators are unable to move more quickly or more autonomously than they do. Teachers do not understand the districts' constraints and district administrators, for their part, have not often tried to explain what they do to teachers.

In the development of new organizational arrangements such education will be essential if teachers are to view the central office as other than stonewalling and central administrators are to view teachers as other than excessively demanding. Developing these new, within district relationships will not be easy and it will take time. Based on the pilot programs, it seems essential.

These and other governance issues need to be addressed in future program development. They do not have to be resolved in order for programs to move forward, but participants would do well to know that they are legitimate concerns lurking in the background.

PART III. CONCLUSION: EFFORT AND OPPORTUNITY

Elaborating the difficulties, dilemmas and questions that emerged from the pioneering efforts described earlier and thinking about how to address them in future program development is an important part of the Commonwealth's education reform movement. These programs' experiences can inform future endeavors. Sometimes, however, listing questions, dilemmas and difficulties puts a damper on people's desire to persevere. It makes the task appear too difficult, the goals unattainable. The experience of the educators in these six programs does not suggest that the task is too difficult; it suggests that it will take effort, thought and patience to accomplish a series of worthwhile goals.

Teachers and college faculty involved in the six Massachusetts programs are enthusiastic about their programs and eager to continue to develop school/college collaborations around teacher education and expanded roles for teachers in schools. All parties report benefits from collaborations to date. As a result of their programs, more attention has been showered on the purpose, content and organization of the field component of pre-service teacher education. Public school teachers report that they are talking to each other about teaching more than in the past. They have occasion to do this because they are in organizational arrangements that foster this conversation -- student teaching seminars, team planning and mentor meetings, for example. Teachers are informing college

faculty about teacher education, about the knowledge, skills and dispositions that would be helpful for novices to develop. Colleges report that they are listening more closely to what classroom teachers are telling them and report that it is useful. Veteran teachers who may not wish to serve as cooperating teachers have found ways to get involved in teacher education more broadly. They have been called upon to do demonstration lessons, to share curriculum materials, or approaches to discipline/classroom management with student teachers in the student teaching seminars. Student teachers and interns work more closely with veteran teachers and see a broader range of teaching roles than in the past. They see teachers work as classroom teachers, curriculum developers, teacher educators, and researchers. And, they see teachers working together, sharing materials and ideas. They see roles and structures that counter the traditional view of the isolated teacher. These experiences and visions will serve to broaden their view of what is possible for teachers to do. In these six program schools, there is developing an environment in which professional practice is part of normal conversation.

Notes

1. The professional development programs and issues considered in this paper focus heavily on professional development for pre-service teachers at the undergraduate and graduate levels and the involvement of veteran teachers in that effort. Because of this orientation, we do not discuss the ways in which a professional development school might provide learning opportunities for veteran teachers outside the context of pre-service teacher education.

2. In order to learn about these programs, we visited the colleges and schools, interviewing faculty, administrators, classroom teachers, interns and student teachers about the early phases of program development and implementation. We were not attempting to evaluate programs, but rather to describe their key components, the process by which they were developed and put in place, issues that were emerging during implementation, and anticipated and unanticipated benefits. Our purpose was to glean insights that would help others as they begin to develop and implement their own professional development schools.

3. Names and addresses of contact persons at each program are listed in Appendix A.

References

Leading the Way: Report of The Special Commission on the Conditions of Teaching. Massachusetts State Legislature, August 1987

Holmes Group. Tomorrow's Teachers: A Report of the Holmes Group, East Lansing, MI, April 1986.

APPENDIX A

Brockton High School and Bridgewater State College: A "Pilot Partnership."

Susan Szachowicz
Social Studies Department
Brockton High School
470 Forest Avenue
Brockton, MA 02401

John F. Myers
Associate Professor, History Department
Bridgewater State College
Tillinghast Hall
Bridgewater, MA 02324

Cambridge Rindge and Latin School/Lincoln-Sudbury Regional High School/Harvard Graduate School of Education.

Diane Tabor
Housemaster
Cambridge Rindge and Latin High School
459 Broadway
Cambridge, MA 02138

Laura Cooper
House West Housemaster
c/o Lincoln-Sudbury Regional High School
390 Lincoln Road
Sudbury, MA 01776

Vicki Jacobs
Assistant Director of Teacher Training
Harvard Graduate School of Education
224 Longfellow Hall
Appian Way
Cambridge, MA 02138

Devotion School, Brookline/Wheelock College

Vivian Troen and Kitty Boles
Devotion Elementary School
345 Harvard Street
Brookline, MA 02146

Karen Worth
College Coordinator: Continuing Education
Wheelock College
200 The Riverway
Boston, MA 02215

East Longmeadow High School and the Academic Disciplines Teacher Education PRogram of the School of Education at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

Earl Seidman, Professor
School of Education
102 Furcolo Hall
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, MA 01003

Helen Schneider
School of Education
113 A Furcolo Hall
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, MA 01003

Peter Cannone
Associate Superintendent, Office of the Superintendent
East Longmeadow Public Schools
East Longmeadow, MA 01028

MESTEP: The Mathematics, English and Science Teacher Education Program, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

George Frost
Director of Summer School
Acton-Boxborough Regional High School
96 Haywood Road
Acton, MA 01720

Richard J. Clark
Director, MESTEP
School of Education
Furcolo Hall
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, MA 01003

Wellesley College-School Collaborative for Improving the Professionalism and Overall Qualifications of Secondary Teachers in Mathematics, Science, Computer Learning, and Critical Foreign Languages.

Alan November
Computer Applications Specialist
Wellesley Public Schools
40 Kingsbury Street
Wellesley, MA 02181

Kenneth Hawes
Assistant Professor, Department of Education
Wellesley College
Wellesley, MA 02181

Education Matters, Inc. is a non-profit research, evaluation and policy analysis group established in 1984. The firm focuses primarily on issues that affect public school teaching and learning, with special concern for students who are served least well by our schools. Education Matters implements studies at the local, state and federal levels, in elementary, secondary and post-secondary institutions. Our purpose is to improve the quality of education by providing useful, timely information to policy makers, program developers, faculty and administrators.

The Massachusetts Field Center for Teaching and Learning was created in 1984 to give teachers an active role in the state's comprehensive school improvement program. The Center's mission is to create opportunities that draw on the experience, insights, and the ideas of teachers as instruments of school change. Programs are designed to revitalize and support teachers as professionals.

The Center is an information resource for practitioners across the state through its collection and dissemination of innovative and successful programs. The Center sponsors opportunities for teachers to talk with each other about their work and profession. The Center is a focal point for studies of teacher incentives and working conditions. The Center seeks to encourage and acknowledge superior teaching.

For further information about Center services and programs and to be placed on the mailing list, please contact:

Massachusetts Field Center for Teaching and Learning
University of Massachusetts at Boston
Wheatley Hall/Third Floor
Boston, Massachusetts 02125
(617) 929-8865

Copies of Professional Development Schools: Beginning the Process are available from the Center.